



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GREEK ἀμφοδον, OSCAN AMVIANUD, AND THE OSCAN EITUNS-INSRIPTIONS

BY CARL D. BUCK

The vexed question of the true significance of the Oscan **eituns**-inscriptions (Nos. 14-18 in my *Oscan-Umbrian Grammar*) is reopened by the discovery of a sixth example, published by Della Corte, *Notizie degli scavi*, 1916, 156 ff., and, with fuller restoration and commentary, by Ribezzo, *Rivista indo-greco-italico*, I, 58 ff. The new inscription is longer than any of the others, but nearly half of the first six lines had been destroyed by the cutting of a window through the wall on which it was inscribed. The result is a tantalizing fragment. Ribezzo's restoration and translation are as follows:

1. eksud amvi[anud eituns]	<i>hoc circuitu itinera</i>
2. set puz haf[iar trfb. t]uv.	<i>sunt ut habeatur aedes publica</i>
3. iní víu mef[iu iní tiurr[is	<i>et via media et turres</i>
4. nertrak ve[ru urublan[u	<i>sinistrā portam Urblanam</i>
5. píis sent ei[sai viai nert[raḡ	<i>quae sunt. in ista via, sinistra</i>
6. veru urubla[nu iní tiu[rí	<i>portam Urblanam et turrim</i>
7. mefira faammant	<i>Mefiram, stationem habent (edicunt)</i>
8. L. Pupid. L. Mr. Puril Mṛ.	<i>L. Pupid. L. f. et Mr. Puril. Mr. f.</i>

Ribezzo estimates the number of letters to be supplied much more generously than the first editor, and disproportionately to the number which fill a corresponding space in the extant portion. He justifies this by the assumption that the letters diminished in size toward the end of the line. There is some warrant for this in line 6, where the extant final letters are noticeably smaller, and where the restoration given seems in fact the only possible one. (For the hitherto unknown **veru Urublanu**, cf. *Urblanenses*, *Urbulanenses* in two Latin election notices found in the same neighborhood, *Notizie* 1916, 153; 1919, 239.) But in lines 2-5 the final letters are of average size, and, while owing to variation in the width of different letters and in spacing no exact estimate is infallible, the number of letters supplied by Ribezzo seems excessive and in some cases virtually impossible. In line 4 one may perhaps accept the attractive **ve[ru Urublan]u**, though the

name of some other gate with fewer letters would be easier to manage (Della Corte suggested **Sarnn**]u with a query). In line 3 I should prefer **Mef**]iru to Ribezzo's less specific **mef**]iu, assuming with Della Corte that there was a 'via Mefira' as well as a 'turris Mefira'. But this makes it the more difficult to accept Ribezzo's restoration of the rest of the line. In line 2 the letter preceding the final **v** was almost certainly not **u**, and the restoration **trīb. tuv.** is unlikely anyway, since **trībud tūv.** in my No. 18 must designate a specific building and one in quite a different locality. In line 5 Ribezzo's restoration makes a line of twenty-four letters, although the extant first ten (including the mutilated **i**) fill almost precisely one-half the length of the full line. Furthermore, nothing but the vertical stroke is left of the final letter, so that a **k** is only one of several possibilities. However I can only express my doubts of Ribezzo's restoration of lines 2-5, and especially lines 2 and 5, without offering any satisfactory substitute. Whether the verb in line 7 is to be read **faammant** or **faa mant** (with a blotch of paint covering an error in the fourth space, Della Corte) is immaterial. It of course goes with the third singular **faamat** which occurs in four of the five other inscriptions, and for which I now incline to the connection with Lat. *fāma* and the meaning 'command.'

In line 1, where even the final letters are effaced, there is room, if not for [**anud eītuns**], certainly for [**annud eīt.**], as in my No. 15, and it is as good as certain that the inscription begins with the same three words as all the others of the series. This being so, the following **set** decides the question regarding the form of **eītuns** in favor of the nominative plural. But this leaves the general problem of the purpose of the inscriptions as before. For the translation 'eunto,' though adapted to Nissen's theory, was not a necessary part of it, was not in fact accepted by Nissen, who took **eītuns** as a noun 'iter' or 'itinera.' The Italian editors of the new inscription do not draw from it any new light on the general problem, and Ribezzo's translation 'hoc circuitu itinera sunt' or 'ab hoc ambivio ituri sunt' is in line with the Nissen interpretation. Both reject the theory of Skutsch, *Glotta*, I, 104 ff., and rightly. Neither this nor any other interpretation which rests on the notion that these inscriptions are private advertisements has any plausibility. They are certainly

official notices, and with mention of gates and towers in four of the six, they no doubt have to do with military defence. So far Nissen was right. But I am now convinced that we must definitely abandon his idea that they are directions to the allied soldiery in the Social War as to *how to find their way* to their stations. It may be recalled that Mau, *Röm. Mitt.*, XIV, 105 ff., after rejecting the fanciful suggestions of Degering, accepted Nissen's interpretation, as he says (p. 111), only provisionally and in default of a better, while he fully recognized and concisely stated the very serious difficulties involved in it. These and still other objections were also urged by Skutsch, *Jahresbericht für roman. Phil.*, VI, 432 and *Glotta*, I, 107 ff., and need not be repeated here.

In one particular the latest inscription adds the finishing touch to these objections. According to Nissen's interpretation the **amvianud** in my Nos. 15, 16, had to refer, not to the street upon which they faced, but to the nearest street leading off it. It was strange that No. 15 was not on the corner pillar, but on the one next to the corner. With the discovery of the fifth inscription, my No. 18, the difficulty increased, but was thought not insuperable, since the position was at least not far from the corner of a blind alley which might have run through at the time when the inscription was painted. Now comes the sixth inscription, on the front of the second house from the nearest side street (cf. the topographical sketch, *Notizie*, 1917, p. 248). It is utterly impossible to reconcile the topographical conditions of the various inscriptions with the interpretation of **amvianud** as 'street, alley, detour' or any other indication of direction to be followed. All these topographical difficulties (as well as a stylistic one) vanish if we give up the whole idea of guides for strange soldiery, and recognize mobilization notices telling the citizens of the various sections of the city where they are to mobilize (*not* how they are to get there). "From this quarter the **eituns** (are):".

The comparison of Osc. **amvianud** with Gr. ἀμφοδον is a very old one, and was known to Nissen, who discussed the technical use of the latter but refused to recognize its applicability to the Oscan. Again recently Kretschmer, *Glotta*, X, 159 ff., has cited **amvianud** as probably a semantic loanword from ἀμφοδον, which he says "hat

genau die Bedeutung 'Strassenviertel, Stadtteil, Gasse' od. dgl. die wir für **amvianud** erwarten." Kretschmer does not enter into a discussion of the general problem of the **eifuns**-inscriptions. Nor for **ἄμφοδον** itself does he come to a decision as to the relative priority and frequency of the meanings given. In this regard Crönert's article in the new Passow is unsatisfactory. (Preisigke, *Fachwörter*, cited by Kretschmer, is not accessible to me.) Misleading definitions are still frequently repeated. Hence, before returning to the Osc. **amvianud**, it will not be superfluous to discuss further the history of this word **ἄμφοδον**, which is so rare in writers of the classical period and so common later.

Kretschmer remarks that the semantic development is rather peculiar and not wholly clear: "es fragt sich nämlich, ob **ἄμφοδον** eigentlich = τὸ ἀμφ' ὁδοῦ 'die Häuser zu beiden Seiten einer Strasse' (Planta II, 77) oder, wie die antiken Erklärungen ἡ ὥσπερ ἐκ τετραγώνου διαγεγραμμένη ὁδὸς und τετράρῳμον ἄμφοδον (Crönert *a. a. O.*) annehmen lassen, 'die um ein Strassenviertel laufenden Strassen' bedeutete. Aus der Glosse C. Gloss. lat. III, 105, 18 *Compitum ἄμφοδον* ergibt sich noch eine weitere Bedeutung 'Kreuzweg' Sicher ist aber, dass das Wort im Sinne von Stadtteil, der mehrere Gassen einschliesst, aber auch einer einzelnen Strasse verwendet wird." Of the alternative interpretations it is the second which is commonly adopted in our lexicons. But wrongly. From the point of view of grammatical analysis we have the choice between a prepositional-phrase compound,¹ 'that which is on both sides of the street,' and a possessive compound of the **ἐνθεος** type, 'that which has a street on both sides.' But the latter is not an apt expression for 'that which has a street on four sides,' and furthermore the natural unit is not the 'square' or 'block' of modern cities, but the complex of houses facing a street and forming a court which may readily be closed at each end.² Such was the primary meaning of **ἄμφοδον**, not 'street'

¹ I adopt this concise term from Smyth's Greek Grammar § 643, and in return point out that his first example, "ἄποικος colonist (ἀπ' οἴκου away from home)" were better omitted, since **ἀποικος** is equally intelligible as a possessive compound ("one who has his home away") and should be so taken in view of **μέτοικος** and **ἐνοικος** which must be possessive compounds.

² Cf. the description of Cairo streets in the early nineteenth century in Lane's *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, p. 7, quoted by Nissen, *Pomp. Studien*, p. 506. "To the right and left of the great thoroughfares are the bystreets and quar-

as a passage, but a 'street of houses.' From this it was extended to apply to a group of such streets forming a 'quarter'¹ as described by Lane, *loc. cit.*

It is in this sense, corresponding to Lat. *vicus* in its technical use, that ἄμφοδον is used by the lexicographers and scholiasts, e.g. Pollux IX. 35, 36, Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 5; likewise in many passages of late writers, e.g. (Galen) ἐνὸς ἀμφοδου τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ πλείονας οὐχ εἶχον οἰκήτορας, said of towns that had no more inhabitants than a single quarter (*vicus*) of Rome, or (*Chron. Pasch.*) ἐμέρισεν τὴν πόλιν εἰς ἑπτὰ ἄμφοδα καὶ ἔστησεν ἀνθρώπους ἰδίους ἀμφοδάρχας. Philo Byz. 92, 93 describes the proper defense of the ἄμφοδα and the duties of the ἀμφοδάρχαι (the Roman *vici magistri*), while Aeneas Tacticus uses the terms ῥύμαι, ῥυμάρχαι.

The material has been greatly augmented by the papyri publications, nearly every volume of which contains numerous examples of the word. For a time it was thought that the meaning here was 'street,' and the statement of Wilcken, *Gr. Ostraka*, I, 432, "τὸ ἄμφοδον ist die in Aegypten übliche Bezeichnung der Strasse" was repeated for more than a decade after it was shown to be erroneous. The actual use in the papyri is the same as that in the authors quoted above. Cf. *Ox. Pap.*, II (1899), 189: "It is clear that ἄμφοδον and λαύρα are coextensive. They denote an area larger than that of a street with the houses fronting on it (the term for which is ῥύμη; cf. *O.P.*, I. XCIX. 7), but somewhat less than that implied by 'quarter.' Oxyrhynchus had at least 14 ἄμφοδα and Arsinoe still more." So also now Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I (1912), 40: "Die Städte waren meist in ἄμφοδα genannte Stadtquartieren geteilt, die unter ἀμφοδάρχαι und ἀμφοδογραμματεῖς standen."

In the few inscriptional occurrences the meaning of ἄμφοδον is again the same, though it has been taken otherwise. So certainly

ters. Most of the bystreets are thoroughfares and have large wooden gates at each end, closed at night and kept by a porter within, who opens to any person requiring to be admitted. The quarters mostly consist of several narrow lanes, having but one general entrance, which is also closed at night, but several have a bystreet passing through them."

¹ Although 'quarter' now usually connotes a more extensive section, and 'precinct' in its current municipal application would in some ways answer better, the term will be retained in the following.

ἄμφοδα τὸ Σαμοθράικον καὶ τὸ ἐχόμενον ἕως τοῦ ποτάμου in the inscription discussed by Wilhelm, *Beiträge*, pp. 183 ff., although, misled by the earlier statement of Wilcken quoted above, he translates "die Samothrakische Strasse." So also, I believe, in the Pergamenian ἀστυνόμων νόμος, *Ditt. Or.* 483. 80. Kolbe, *Att. Mitt.*, XXVII (1902), 62 ff., after quoting some of the literary examples of ἄμφοδον in the sense of 'Stadtbezirk,' adds: "Anders in Pergamum. Hier ist ἄμφοδον nur die Strasse, wie sich aus dem Passus τῶν κοινῇ ἀνακαθαρθέντων ἀμφόδων deutlich ergibt. Mit dieser Bedeutung steht der Gebrauch von ἄμφοδον in den ägyptischen Papyri im Einklang." Here too the error embodied in the last sentence has prejudiced judgment of the inscriptional use of the word. In this case, to be sure, the context seems at first sight to require the meaning 'street.' For the first two columns (lines 1-90) of the inscription deal with the care of the streets, and even in the same passage we have a reference to street-cleaning in τῆς ἐκδόσεως τῶν κοπρίων. But when we read in lines 29, 30 παρεχέτωσαν δὲ καθαρὸς καὶ πορευσίμους τὰς ὁδοὺς, and in line 51 εἰς τὴν ἀνακάθαρσιν τῶν ὁδῶν, why do we not here too have simply τῶν κοινῇ ἀνακαθαρθέντων ὁδῶν? Because in this passage which follows the caption Πράξεως or 'Enforcement of Payment,' it was appropriate to use the more comprehensive term and to speak of the organized quarters that are kept clean from common funds and whose ἀμφοδάρχαι are to insure the collection of the funds. With this understanding of ἄμφοδον, the whole passage gains in clearness: Πράξεως· ἐάν τινες μὴ ἀποδίδωσιν τῶν κοινῇ ἀνακαθαρθέντων ἀμφόδων τὸ γεινόμενον μέρος τῆς ἐκδόσεως τῶν κοπρίων καὶ τῶν ἐπιτιμῶν, λαμβανέτωσαν αὐτῶν οἱ ἀμφοδάρχαι ἐνέχυρα.

The Smyrna inscription, *Ditt. Syll.*³ 961, τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἀνφόδῳ τεταχθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ πύργου τοῦ τῆς Ἀγαθῆς Τύχης ἕως τοῦ τῆς Εὐετηρίας was correctly rendered by the first editor, Perrot, *Rev. arch.*, 1876, 41 ff., "que les hommes du quartier se rangent depuis la tour de la Bonne Fortune jusqu' à celle de l' Heureuse Année."¹

¹ There can be no question that this technical use of ἄμφοδον in the sense of 'quarter' was the common use in Hellenistic times, as attested by the lexicographers and other writers, by the papyri, and by the inscriptions. This is not to deny that the word might also be used in an untechnical sense of a single street of houses or open space. Either 'street' or 'quarter' will suit equally well for ἔφηνε διὰ τῶν ἀμφόδων, *Babr.* 153, τὴν οἰκίαν . . . καὶ τὸ ἄμφοδον, *Hyperides ap. Pollux IX.* 36, οὐ

The striking parallelism between the Smyrna inscription just quoted and the Oscan **eítuns**-inscriptions, one which Nissen refused to recognize fully, is no longer to be resisted. **amvíanud** has the same technical meaning as ἄμφοδον, and may very well be a semantic loanword, as Kretschmer suggested. In form it is likewise a prepositional-phrase compound, only with an added suffix *-āna-* as in Lat. *suburbānus*, *circummurānus*, etc. (for the type cf. Gr. ἐπιθαλάσσιος).¹ **eítuns**, as if Lat. **ilōnēs*, may be formally explained

θύρα, ἀλλ' ἄμφοδῷ διέλευσται, Polyb. XXXIX. 3; and either sense might underlie the compounds ἀνταμφοδέω *Berl. Urkunden* IV, 31, and διαμφοδέω, Eust. 789. 50, meaning 'miss ones way.' The fragment quoted from Aristophanes (Pollux IX. 36, *E.M.*), "Ἀμφοδὸν ἐχρῆν αὐτῷ τεθεῖσθαι τοῦνομα, is an etymological play which shows nothing as to the actual use of the word. This and the fragment from Hyperides comprise the only occurrences of ἄμφοδον that are quotable from authors of the classical period.

The meaning 'crossroad,' for which the glosses *compitum*, ἄμφοδον, or conversely ἄμφοδον, *compitum* (*CGL*. II. 105. 18; III. 306. 39) are cited, is not, so far as I know, otherwise attested. One must reckon with the possibility that the comparison of the two words rests on their common suggestion of open space in the town, rather than on any actual use of ἄμφοδον in the literal sense of 'crossroad.'

The following has been kindly supplied by my colleague, Professor Case.

[*The Use of ἄμφοδον in the Septuagint and the New Testament.*—The Septuagint equivalent of the Hebrew for "street," that is, open space within the town (רחב, *ḥuq*; רחב, *ḥb*), is commonly πλατεία, less frequently δδός or ἐξόδος, rarely δόμη, never ἀγυία. "Ἀμφοδὸν occurs only twice in the Septuagint (Jer. 17:27; 30:16 [49:27, Heb.]), but not for "street." It translates a Hebrew word (ארמון, 'armon), rendered somewhat loosely in English as "palaces." Its more exact meaning however is citadel, or fortified quarter, the reference being to a section of the city rather than to specific buildings. Since the king's lodgings were the most conspicuous part of the fortified quarter, "palaces" may be a legitimate synecdoche, but as a rule the Greek translators adhered more closely to the original meaning by rendering the Hebrew word, which is of frequent occurrence and often in the plural, θεμέλια. In the two exceptional passages of Jeremiah cited above, ἄμφοδον apparently is used in a kindred sense, of that "quarter," or fortified section of the city, in which the king resided. In Symmachus' Greek version of the Old Testament, produced near the end of the second century A.D., ἄμφοδον appears more frequently (ten times) and always with the meaning "streets" (plural), i.e. open spaces (רחב, *ḥuq*). The only occurrence of ἄμφοδον in the New Testament is Mark 11:4, πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄμφοδον, which probably should be rendered "outside at the gate to the open space." (Cf. Klostermann-Gressmann, *Markus*, p. 94, am Tor draussen auf dem freien Platz; also J. Weiss, *Die Schriften* usw., I, 176, draussen an der Tür auf dem Hof.) An addition to the δ-text (fifth or sixth century A.D.) of Acts 19:28 represents the mob at Ephesus as δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον, where ἄμφοδον seemingly is understood to mean an open space suitable for the gathering of a crowd rather than "street" in the more restricted sense.—S. J. CASE.]

¹ Derivation from **amviandum*, which I had only very doubtfully suggested (*Osc.-Umb. Gram.*, p. 187) and which Kretschmer, *Glotta* X. 160, rightly calls an "unwahrscheinliche Grundform," is of course, with the rejection of the meaning 'circuitus,' not to be thought of further.

in various ways—as based upon a verbal noun, either **eit-* or **ei-to-* ‘going,’ or upon the iterative stem seen in Umbr. *etaians* ‘itent’ (cf. Lat. *errō*, *-ōnis* beside *errāre*). As regards its use, the majority of Latin and Greek nouns of this type denote persons, so that one has thought of ‘goers, patrols.’ But originally the *n*-stems were nouns of action (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* II. 1. 295) and some have remained such, as Lat. *compāgō*, *aspergō*, Gr. ἀγών, etc. So *eītuns* may mean literally ‘goings’ and have come to be a technical word for ‘mobilization,’ with the notion of action and place like Gr. ἀγών.

“From this quarter the mobilization” is then the uniform opening of all six inscriptions, followed in each case by the designation of where this is to take place. The Greek writers on the tactics of the defense of cities prescribe mobilization at points on the wall and at the ἀγορά, θέατρον and other public places. In my Nos. 14–16 the positions are indicated by the gates and towers of the wall. In No. 17, which is near the unwallcd southwest side of the town (“Here, where the slope was steepest and the city best defended by nature, the wall had been removed and its place occupied by houses, at a comparatively early date, probably in the second century B.C.” Mau-Kelsey, p. 237), the mobilization is to take place at a point between two private houses (the location of which was of course familiar to those of the same precinct; the well-known difficulty under Nissen’s interpretation disappears). In No. 18 they are to mobilize about certain public buildings. In the new inscription, positions on the walls are indicated, but here we have the unique feature of an *ut*-clause (**puz haf--**), apparently a clause of purpose **after** the verbal notion of *eītuns*, “from this quarter the mobilization is for the purpose of holding(?)” Only such difficulties remain as are due to the uncertainty of the restorations.